UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,813	04/30/2001	Kevin David Eld	10013062-1	3203

22879　　7590　　05/19/2005
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
LIN, KELVIN Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 February 2005</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5,14,16-20 and 23-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5,14,16-20, and 23-31</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

Detailed Action

Response to Amended Claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1,2, 5-14, 16-20, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being

anticipated by Poole et al., (U.S. Patent 6006242).

3.   Regarding claim 1, Poole teaches a method of distributing a plurality of

documents, (Poole clearly teaches that ".. provides the inferencing capabilities

of the Inferencd Engine in a form that may be distributed to end-users ..The IEEE

standard language scheme is used to translate the inferencing power of the

inference engine into a distributable form " – Poole, col.51, l.45-53).

the method comprising :

- associating a metadata file with each of the documents (Poole, col.

  5, l.6-9, The definition of metadata includes: " .. information required

  by the runtime.." - The Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 4th edition,

  here, the metadata file is the entity reference);

- applying at least one content attribute to each of the documents,

  including analyzing a content of each of the documents (Poole, fig.4,

  col.7, I.17-21, which teaches document construction, determining

  (analyzing), and resolving), and assigning content attribute values

  to the content attributes for each of the documents based on the

  content thereof (Poole, col.43, I.59-60). Including appending the

  metadata file of each of the documents with the at least one content

  attribute (Poole, col. 14, I.32-38); and the content attribute value

  (Poole, col. 13, I.43-47) thereof;

- assigning at least one content group to each of the documents

  based on the at least one content attribute and the content attribute

  value (Poole, col. 13, I.43-47) thereof, including modifying the

  metadata file of each of the documents to include the at least one

  content group thereof (Poole, col. 11, I.59-67); and

- distributing the documents based on the at least one content group

  of each of the documents (Poole, col.25, I.14-20, col.51, I.45-53) .

4.   Regarding claim 2, Poole further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

associating the metadata file with each of the documents includes

identifying at least one of a title, an author, a date, and an identification of each of

the documents (Poole, col.21, I.17).

5.   Regarding claim 5, Poole further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

assigning the at least one content group to each of the documents

includes defining a plurality of content groups including the at least one content

group, defining at least one condition for each of the content groups, and

assigning the at least one content group to at least one of the documents if the at

least one of the documents satisfies the at least one condition of the at least one

content group (Poole, Table 14&15, col. 25, l.14-67, col.51, l.45-53).

6.   Regarding claim 6, Poole further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein

defining the at least one condition for each of the content groups includes

specifying at least one of a plurality of content attributes including the at least

one content attribute and a content attribute value for the at least one of the

plurality of content attributes (Poole, col.16, l.56-59).

7.   Regarding claim 7, Poole further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein

assigning the at least one content group to the at least one of the documents

includes assigning at least one content group value to a content group attribute

of the at least one of the documents (Poole, col.14, l.29-39, col. 25, l.17-20).

8.   Regarding claim 8, Poole further discloses the method of claim 7, wherein

modifying the metadata file of each of the documents to include the at least one

content group includes modifying the metadata file of the at least one of the

documents to include the at least one content group value for the content group

attribute (Poole. Col. 69, l.45-54).

9.   Regarding claim 9, Poole further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

distributing the documents includes defining a plurality of content

categories, associating the at least one content group with at least one of the

content categories, and distributing for the at least one of the content categories

each of the documents assigned the at least one content group (Poole, col. 26,

l.66-67, col. 33, l.14-15, col.51, l.45-53).

10.   Regarding claim 10, Poole further discloses the method of claim 9, wherein

defining the plurality of content categories includes defining at least one content

sub-category for the at least one of the content categories, and wherein

associating the at least one content group with the at least one of the content

categories includes associating the at least one content group with the at least

one content sub-category (Poole, col. 25, l.45-50, here, the container functions

similar to the categories in this art).

11.   Regarding claim 11, Poole further discloses the method of claim 9, wherein

distributing the documents includes defining a navigational model

identifying the content categories, presenting the navigational model to an

audience, receiving a request for documents associated with one of the content

categories from the audience, and distributing the documents associated with the

one of the content categories to the audience, including distributing the

documents assigned the at least one content group associated with the at least

one of the content categories (Poole, col. 9, l.55-64, col.51, l.45-53).

12.   Regarding claim 12, Poole further discloses the method of claim 11, wherein

distributing the documents further includes defining a communication link

between a host of the navigational model and the audience, wherein receiving

the request for documents includes receiving the request for documents

associated with the one of the content categories from the audience via the

communication link, and wherein distributing the documents includes distributing

the documents associated with the one of the content categories to the audience

via the communication link (Poole, col.9, l.50-64, col.51, l.45-53).

13.   Regarding claim 13, Poole further discloses the method of claim 12, wherein

defining the communication link includes defining an Internet communication link

between the host of the navigational model and the audience (Poole, col.11, l.22-

24).

14.   Regarding claims 14-17, have similar limitations as claims 1, 3, 5, and 6.

Therefore, claims 14-17 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the

rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, and 6.

15.   Regarding claim 18, Poole further discloses a document management system

adapted to manage distribution of a plurality of documents(Poole, col.51, l.45-53),

the document management system comprising:

- a metadata architecture system adapted to analyze a content of

    each of the documents apply at least one content attribute to each

    of the documents based on the content thereof (Poole, fig.4, col.7,

    l.17-21, which teaches document construction, determining

    (analyzing), and resolving),

    assign a content attribute value to the content attribute of each of

    the documents based on the content thereof, and append a

    metadata file of each of the documents with the at least one content

attribute and the content attribute value thereof; (Poole, col. 14,

l.32-38, col.43, l.59-60);

- a logic rules application system adapted to assign at least one

  content group to each of the documents based on the at least one

  content attribute and the content attribute value thereof, and

  modify the metadata file of each of the documents to include the at

  least one content group thereof(Poole, col. 46, l. 56-67); and

- a document distribution system adapted to distribute the documents

  based on the at least one content group of each of the documents

  (Poole, col. 11, l.59-67).

16.   Regarding claim 19, Poole further discloses the document management system

of claim 18, further comprising: a document management data storage system

adapted to store the documents therein (Poole, col.8, l.5-7).

17.   Regarding claim 20, Poole further discloses the document management system

claim 18, wherein the metadata file of each of the documents includes at least

one of a title, an author, a date, and an identification of the respective one of the

documents (Poole, col.21, l.17).

18.   Regarding claim 23, Poole further discloses the document management system

of claim 18, wherein the logic rules application system defines a plurality of

content groups including the at least one content group and defines at least one

condition for each of the content groups, and wherein the logic rules application

system is adapted to assign the at least one content group to at least one of the

documents if the at least one of the documents satisfies the at least one

condition of the at least one content group (Poole, col. 17, I.23-33).

19.   Regarding claim 24, Poole further discloses the document management system

of claim 23, wherein the at least one condition for each of the content groups

specifies at least one of a plurality of content attributes including the at least one

content attribute and a content attribute value for the at least one of the plurality

of content attributes (Poole, col.16, I.56-59) .

20.   Regarding claim 25, Poole further discloses the document management system

of claim 23, wherein the logic rules application system is adapted to assign at

least one content group value for the at least one content group to a content

group attribute of the at least one of the documents (Poole, col. 42, I.43-45).

21.   Regarding claim 26, Poole further discloses the document management system

of claim 25, wherein the logic rules application system is adapted to modify the

metadata file of the at least one of the documents to include the at least one

content group value for the content group attribute (Poole, col. 11, I.59-67).

22.   Regarding claim 27, Poole further discloses the document management system

of claim 18, wherein the document distribution system defines a plurality of

content categories, and wherein the document distribution system is adapted to

associate the at least one content group with at least one of the content

categories and distribute for the at least one of the content categories each of

the documents assigned the at least one content group (Poole, col. 26,

I.66-67, col. 33, I.14-15).

23.   Regarding claim 28, Poole further discloses the document management system

        of claim 27, wherein the document distribution system defines a navigational

        model identifying the content categories, and wherein the document distribution

        system is adapted to present the navigational model to an audience, receive a

        request for documents associated with one of the content categories from the

        audience, and distribute the documents associated with the one of the content

        categories to the audience (Poole, col. 9, l.55-64).

24.   Regarding claim 29, Poole further discloses the document management system

        of claim 28, wherein the document distribution system is adapted to distribute the

        documents assigned the at least one content group associated with the at least

        one of the content categories (Poole, col. 9, l.62-64).

25.   Regarding claim 30, Poole further discloses the document management system

        of claim 28, wherein a host of the navigational model is configured to

        communicate with the audience via a communication link, and wherein the

        document distribution system is adapted to receive the request for the

        documents associated with the one of the content categories from the audience

        via the communication link and distribute the documents associated with the one

        of the content categories to the audience via the communication link (Poole,

        col.9, l.50-64).

26.   Regarding claim 31, Poole further discloses the document management system

        of claim 30, wherein the communication link includes an Internet communication

        link (Poole, col.11, l.22-24).

Response to Remarks

27.   The Application's arguments with respect to claims 1,2,5-14, 16-20, and 23-31, have been considered but are not persuasive . Examiner appreciates detail description of prior art.

28.   Regarding claims 1, and 14, applicant argues that Poole does not teach or suggest a method of distributing a plurality of documents as claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 14.

Examiner contends Poole teaches that ".. provides the inferencing capabilities of the Inferencd Engine in a form that may be distributed to end-users .. The IEEE standard language scheme is used to translate the inferencing power of the inference engine into a distributable form " – Poole, col.51, l.45-53).

29.   Applicant also argues that the document of Poole have not been constructed yet. Examiner contends Poole clearly teaches document construction, determining (analyzing), and resolving see (Poole, fig.4, col.7, l.17-21).

Conclusion

30.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first replay is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTH from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898.

The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KAMINI SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/11/05
KYL